



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,140	01/09/2001	Kazumasa Ueda	2185-0499P	6542

2292 7590 12/04/2002

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

MARCHESCHI, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/756,140

Applicant(s)

UEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Michael A Marcheschi

Art Unit

1755

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7,9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-2 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 1020501 A1.

EP 1020501 A2 teaches in the entire document, specifically the description of the polymers, an aqueous polishing composition that comprises a polymer comprising a mixture of various monomers. The composition can contain other additives (i.e. oxidizers and other particles).

The reference teach aqueous compositions which comprises a polymer that comprises a mixture of monomers and this appears to read on and therefore make obvious the claimed polymer particle because it is the examiners position that the resulting polymer particle contains the claimed functional groups in the absence of any evidence showing the contrary.

Since applicants have not perfected the priority claim (certified translation of the priority documents), this reference can be applied.

Claims 1-2, 4, 5, 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wang et al. (US 2002/0077035).

Wang et al. teaches in the entire document, an aqueous polishing composition (i.e. abrasive for metal) that comprises an ion exchange resin particle having the claimed size. The composition can contain other additives (i.e. oxidizers and benzotriazole).

The claimed invention is anticipated by the reference because said reference teaches an abrasive comprising ion exchange particles. In the alternative, no patentable distinction is seen

09/756,140

Art Unit: 1755

to exist between the reference and the claimed invention in the absence of any evidence showing the contrary.

This reference is based on a provisional application that has a 1999 filing date.

Claims 6-10 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wang et al. (US 2002/0077035).

The reference teaches ion exchange resin particles and it is the examiners position that this broadly reads on anion exchange resins, cation exchange resins and chelate resin because these are all ion exchange resins. In addition, **□A generic disclosure renders a claimed species prima facie obvious. *Ex parte George* 21 USPQ 2d 1057, 1060 (BPAI 1991); *In re Woodruff* 16 USPQ 2d 1934; *Merk & Co. v. Biocraft Lab. Inc.* 10 USPQ 2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971)□.**

With respect to the milling, the reference states in the last two lines of section [0037] that the particles can be further processed into other forms and this suggests and therefore makes obvious milling, whether it be dry or wet milling. In addition, the use of two milling steps, as set forth in claim 9, is well within the level of ordinary skill in the art absent **critical** evidence to the contrary.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1755

In view of the teachings as set forth above, it is the examiners position that the references reasonably teach or suggest the limitations of the rejected claims.

**A reference is good not only for what it teaches but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. *In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (CAFC 1989); *In re Bode* USPQ 12; *In re Lamberti* 192 USPQ 278; *In re Bozek* 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); *In re Van Mater* 144 USPQ 421; *In re Jacoby* 135 USPQ 317; *In re LeGrice* 133 USPQ 365; *In re Preda* 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968)". In addition, "A reference can be used for all it realistically teaches and is not limited to the disclosure in its preferred embodiments" See *In re Van Marter*, 144 USPQ 421.**

Evidence of unexpected results must be clear and convincing. *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548. Evidence of unexpected results must be commensurate in scope with the subject matter claimed. *In re Linder* 173 USPQ 356.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Marcheschi whose telephone number is (703) 308-3815. The examiner can be normally be reached on Monday through Thursday between the hours of 8:30-6:00 and every other Friday between the hours of 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiners supervisor, Mark L. Bell, can be reached at (703) 308-3823.

Amendments can also be sent by fax to the numbers set forth below:

For after final amendments, the fax number is (703) 872-9311;

For non-final amendments, the fax number is 703 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Michael Marcheschi

Art unit 1755

11/02

MICHAEL MARCHESCHI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER